

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at items 4, 5 and 6, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In order to overcome these objections, replacement figures are submitted herewith.

The attached drawing(s) include changes to FIGS. 19A to 21B, 31A to 32C, 37 and 38.

The sheet containing FIG. 19 replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 19A and 19B. In FIG. 19, the labels "FIG. 19A" and "FIG. 19B" are deleted and the labels "FIG. 19," "PART A" and "PART B" are added.

The sheet containing FIG. 20 replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 20A and 20B. In FIG. 20, the labels "FIG. 20A" and "FIG. 20B" are deleted and the labels "FIG. 20," "PART A" and "PART B" are added.

The sheet containing FIG. 21 replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 21A and 21B. In FIG. 21, the labels "FIG. 21A" and "FIG. 21B" are deleted and the labels "FIG. 21," "PART A" and "PART B" are added.

The sheet containing FIG. 31 replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 31A, 31B and 31C. In FIG. 31, the labels "FIG. 31A," "FIG. 31B" and "FIG. 31C" are deleted and the labels "FIG. 31," "PART A," "PART B" and "PART C" are added.

The sheet containing FIG. 32 replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 32A, 32B and 32C. In FIG. 32, the labels "FIG. 32A," "FIG. 32B" and "FIG. 32C" are deleted and the labels "FIG. 32," "PART A," "PART B" and "PART C" are added.

The sheet containing FIG. 37 replaces the original sheet including FIG. 37. In FIG. 37, the legend "PRIOR ART" is added, and a dotted line between "Flow Management Server 20" and "Application H" is added with the label "NO EXECUTION."

The sheet containing FIG. 38 replaces the original sheet including FIG. 38. In FIG. 38, the legend "PRIOR ART" is added.

Approval and entry of these changes to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-8 have been pending.

Claims 1-8 are rejected.

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification, drawings and claims are amended, claim 7 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at items 4 and 6, the Examiner objected to FIGS. 37, 38, 20A-21B and 31A-32C. According to the foregoing, corrected drawing replacement sheets are submitted. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action at item 5, the Examiner objected to the drawings in Figures 2, 10, 22-27 and 37 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h) because of the "partial views."

37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h)(2) recites:

Partial views. When necessary, a view of a large machine or device in its entirety **may be broken into partial views** on a single sheet, or extended over several sheets if there is no loss in facility of understanding the view.

Regarding figures 2, 10 and 22-27, applicants respectfully submit that partial drawings are permitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h)(2) because "there is no loss in facility of understanding the view." Applicants respectfully submit that figure 1 clearly shows the connection between Business System A 3, Business System B 4, Business System C 5 and Event Management apparatus 1 and FIGS. 2, 10 and 22-27 are proper partial views showing only the Business Systems of FIG. 1. Therefore Applicants respectfully submits that figures 2, 10 and 22-27 comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the foregoing, a replacement for figure 37 is provided to correct the same. In the replacement figure for figure 37, a dotted line between "Flow Management Server 20" and "Application H" is added with the label "NO EXECUTION." Support for the amendment

can be found, for example, in the Specification at paragraph 5, lines 4-6. Applicants respectfully submit that figure 37, as amended, complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action at item 6, the Examiner objected to the drawings in Figures 20A to 21B, and 31A to 32C because of the “numbered figures overlap.” In accordance with the foregoing, replacement sheets containing FIGS. 19, 20, 21, 31 and 32 are provided. Applicants respectfully submit that the replacements containing FIGS. 19, 20, 21, 31 and 32 comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. Accordingly, withdrawal of the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

Approval and entry of the changes to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS:

The Office Action, at item 9, rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly “being incomplete for omitting essential elements...the ‘event queue’ see page 11 paragraph 0031...”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertion, because the embodiment in claim 1, for example, recites in part “**event data collection means** for collecting event data which is from the plurality of business systems,” particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming event data is from the business systems. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Independent claims 6 and 8 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for similar reasons. Withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, at item 10, rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because of being “vague.” In accordance with the foregoing, independent claims 1, 6 and 8 are amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection, taking into consideration the Examiner’s comments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim rejection.

The Office Action, at item 10, further rejections claim 2, for allegedly providing insufficient antecedent basis for “the outputted tree.” In accordance with the foregoing, claim 2 is amended for clarity and in accordance with the Examiner’s comments, to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(A) REJECTIONS:

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Schiefer et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0249644, hereinafter referred to as "Schiefer," in view of Bolene, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163329, hereinafter referred to as "Bolene."

Independent claims 1, 6 and 8 are allegedly unpatentable over Schiefer and Bolene.

Schiefer discloses a method to automate business decisions by capturing events simply by using an ETL tool and processing the captured data. For Example, Schiefer, at paragraph [0013], discusses "the present invention [of Schiefer] provides an ETL system based on the concept of a software container module that oversees the capture of events and the transformation and evaluation of the events."

However, Schiefer does not disclose what the event data comprises. That is, Schiefer fails to disclose or suggest "the event data extracted in the plurality of business systems comprising information showing an execution status of an application which executes each of a plurality of applications, the plurality of applications executing the plurality of businesses," as recited, for example, in the embodiment of claim 1.

Schiefer further discusses, in paragraph 130, "ETL applications can be divided into modules which include a set of event adapters, ETlets, or evaluators." However, Schiefer fails to disclose or suggest "event relation means for grouping the collected event data ~~in units of business data on the basis of~~ based upon the business process definition information, and relating ~~business data collected as~~ the grouped event data based upon the plurality of business data," as recited in the embodiment of claim 1. In other words, according to the claimed embodiment, the collected event data is grouped into business data, and that the grouped event data is related on the basis of the plurality of business data.

Further, Schiefer, does not disclose or suggest the claimed "output means for outputting ~~relation between business data~~ the related event data in a tree form by retrieving the event data from the event management data storage means ~~on the basis of inputted~~ based upon input retrieval conditions," as recited in the embodiment of claim 1. In other words, Schiefer et al. cannot group and relate the collected event data, and output the event data in the tree form.

Bolene discloses displaying an organization in a tree form simply. However, Bolene does not disclose that business process or business data is displayed in the tree form. In other words, Bolene also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed "event data collection means for

collecting event data ~~which is from the plurality of business systems, the event data extracted in the plurality of business systems comprising~~ information showing an execution status of an application ~~which executes each of a plurality of applications, the plurality of applications executing the plurality of businesses extracted in the business system;~~ event relation means for grouping the collected event data ~~in units of business data on the basis of~~ based upon the business process definition information, and relating ~~business data collected as the grouped event data based upon the plurality of business data,~~ as recited, for example, in the embodiment of claim 1. Therefore, Bolene fails to disclose or suggest "output means for outputting ... the related event data in a tree form."

Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be based on Schiefer and Bolene, because Schiefer, Bolene and any combination thereof only discloses a method to automate business decisions, but Schiefer and Bolene fail to disclose or suggest the claimed

event data collection means for collecting event data ~~which is from the plurality of business systems, the event data extracted in the plurality of business systems comprising~~ information showing an execution status of an application ~~which executes each of a plurality of applications, the plurality of applications executing the plurality of businesses extracted in the business system;~~

event relation means for grouping the collected event data ~~in units of business data on the basis of~~ based upon the business process definition information, and relating ~~business data collected as the grouped event data based upon the plurality of business data;~~

event management data storage means for storing the related ~~business event~~ data; and

output means for outputting ~~relation between business data the related event data~~ in a tree form by retrieving ~~the event data from the event management data storage means on the basis of inputted~~ based upon input retrieval conditions

Independent claims 6 and 8 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for similar reasons as independent claim 1.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependence from the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims, and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 10/823,562


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 10, 2007

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501